REMARKS

The foregoing amendment is submitted to more clearly set forth the claimed invention and to highlight those features of the claimed invention which clearly distinguish over the cited prior art.

The lottery ticket as presently claimed has a first play area comprising a plurality of first jig-saw type puzzle pieces each of which has an irregular shape and at least one first irregular shaped mating surface which is adapted to mate to a complimentary irregular shaped mating surface of at least one other first jig-saw type puzzle piece appearing in the first play area. Support for the amendment can be found in the example provided in Figure 2 and the accompanying description.

The present invention also includes a jig-saw type puzzle piece identification system which comprises first indicia appearing on at least some of the first jig-saw type puzzle pieces and second indicia appearing on all of the second jig-saw type puzzle pieces wherein a match of the first and second indicia is indicative of a match between the different type of jig-saw type puzzle pieces which enables completion of the desired jig-saw puzzle without moving the pieces as required in the Hopkins prior art.

The presence of an irregular shaped mating surface as now set forth in claim 1 is also set forth in a preferred manner in claim 3 wherein there are provided complimentary projections/cavities on the irregular shaped mating surfaces to enable the pieces to mate with each other. The amendment made to claim 16 conforms that claim to the language now employed in claim 1. Accordingly, all amendments to the claims are supported in the application as filed and do not raise new issues, justifying entry and full consideration of the amendments at this time.

The claims of the application stand rejected as obvious over the combination of Pollard ('815) in view of Hopkins ('533). Pollard is stated to disclose an instant bingo game and game card. Claim 1 as originally cast is considered obvious because it is alleged to simply be a conventional scratch and win ticket. The Office Action states that it would have been obvious to use any type of indicia citing In re Gulack. The rejection is hereby traversed and reconsideration is respectfully suggested.

Pollard shows a bingo card including a caller's card in which printed indicia (i.e. numbers) are covered by a scratch-off layer. A player's card (of which there are four) shown in Figure 1 has no scratch-off layer. Accordingly, the caller's card may be regarded as corresponding to the first play area of claim 1 and the player's card as corresponding to the second play area. The indicia shown in the caller's card (see numeral 26 of Figure 1 of Pollard) is a number. It is not a puzzle piece as

claimed in the present invention because the present invention requires that the puzzle pieces have an irregular shape and have an irregular mating surface. The numbers provided by Pollard are not irregularly shaped nor do they have irregularly shaped mating surfaces. These are structural features required of the present claims.

The irregular shape and irregular mating surfaces of the puzzle pieces are neither taught nor suggested by Pollard. Furthermore, there is a relationship between the irregular shaped puzzle pieces and their respective irregular shaped mating surfaces that must be satisfied to "solve the puzzle" and win a prize. Thus, there is a meaningful relationship between the puzzle pieces and the substrate. The puzzle pieces in the first play area relate to the puzzle pieces in the second play area in a manner which is unique to the present invention and is not just a changing of the printed indicia.

In re Gulack stands for the proposition that if Applicants had merely substituted different numbers for those used in the Pollard bingo game, then patentability would be problematic. In the present invention, Applicants are not relying on numbers of any type but rather an entirely different system of puzzle pieces which are irregularly shaped and have irregularly shaped mating surfaces to simulate a jig-saw type of mating relationship. There is no jig-saw type of mating relationship in Pollard and indeed, there is no intertwining of respective game pieces

as required in the present invention to obtain a prize winning combination. As indicated in Figure 2, it is the interrelationship of multiple puzzle pieces which enables the player to claim a prize. This is contrary to Pollard in which numbers are used to determine if a prize is won as in many conventional type of lottery tickets.

The conclusion reached in the Office Action that there is no novel and unobvious functional relationship between the printed matter and the substrate is incorrect. Applicants have provided an effective means of providing a jig-saw type of lottery game in which the player is more easily enabled to determine a winner on matching multiple puzzle pieces than what is taught in the prior art. Quite obviously, Pollard is not directed to such a game but is instead directed to a bingo type of game which relies on the accumulation of numbers to determine a winning ticket.

Hopkins discloses a jig-saw type of game but, as previously indicated, it is disadvantageous because the player must literally remove the jig-saw puzzle pieces from one area of the ticket and place it on another area of the ticket which can result in lost puzzle pieces.

The Office Action seeks to combine the references to render the claims obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. However, one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine these references as suggested in the Office Action. Starting with Pollard, there is provided a standard bingo game showing rows and columns of

numbers with each column identified by the conventional letters "BINGO". The columns and rows are fixed because each of the play spaces is a square containing a number. Each of the play areas (comprised of the rows and columns) is likewise a square. Hopkins provides a square play area with jig-saw type puzzle pieces which must be removed and placed on another portion of the lottery ticket. If these references were combined, the numbers from the Pollard caller's card would have to be removed and placed on the player's card (as is done in a conventional bingo game).

The claimed invention, however, does not require removal of pieces. Instead the claimed invention provides an identification system which enables complex puzzles to be formed from irregular shaped puzzle pieces through the mating of irregular shaped mating surfaces. The player is assured of being able to properly associate the selected jig-saw type puzzle pieces in the appropriate spaces in the second play area by the unique identification system.

It is therefore submitted that the present claims are in condition for allowance and early passage to issue is therefore deemed proper and is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fee is due in connection with this matter. However, if any fee is due, it should be charged to Deposit Account No. 23-0510.

Respectfully submitted,

Allen R. Kipnes, Esquire
Registration No. 28,433
Attorney for Applicant

Address All Correspondence to:
Allen R. Kipnes, Esquire
WATOV & KIPNES, P.C.
P.O. Box 247
Princeton Junction, NJ 08550
(609) 243-0330